

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed November 15, 2006. Claims 1-32 stand rejected. In this Amendment, claims 1, 17, 20, 28, 31 and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 32 for minor informalities. The claim has been amended to remove the informalities.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 20 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 20 and 31 have been amended to remove the term "independent" objected to by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 17, 20, 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 17, 20, 28 and 31 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove his rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-15, 20-21, 24-26 and 31-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shannon, (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,618, hereinafter "Shannon"), in view of Dascalu (U.S. Patent No. 5,958,015, hereinafter "Dascalu"). Claims 4-5, 16-19, 22-23 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

Shannon, in view of Dascalu, and further in view of Brandt (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,905, hereinafter “Brandt”).

Shannon discloses an access control mechanism to limit access to information available on the Internet. Shannon uses a network-walker which “continually surfs the web and examines Internet content providers to gather newly found URL’s and IP addresses of web servers or other content providing computers” (Shannon, col. 10, lines 2-6). Content referenced by a newly found URL or IP address is then examined to determine its restriction category, which is stored in an access control database. Users in predetermined groups are associated with specific restricted categories and these associations are stored in a group/category database. When users make requests for web pages, server locations or data files having Internet access addresses that appear in restricted categories, the users are denied access to the requested information (Shannon, col. 8, lines 2-12).

Contrary to the presently claimed invention, Shannon discloses an access control mechanism for a network gateway, and not for a client device in the form of a personal computing device as claimed in the present invention. In addition, Shannon discloses intercepting user requests for content, and searching these user requests for predefined URLs or IP addresses of web pages. That is, Shannon searches for a specific characteristic or metadata associated with a web page residing remotely, and does not perform a local search of the content of the web page itself. In contrast, the presently claimed invention locally searches the contents of multiple data storage media of a client device.

Furthermore, Shannon does not teach or suggest sending a notification of detection of pre-selected data from a client device to a server upon detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data on any of the multiple storage media of the client device, as claimed in the present invention. The Examiner acknowledges that “Shannon is silent with sending a

notification of detection of the pre-selected data to a server via a network” (Office Action, page 5) and cites Dascalu for such teaching. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Dascalu teaches a session wall that listens to communications sent over the network. It listens to communication messages exchanged between a client and a server and determines whether the messages can be permitted based on stored access rules. If a message should not be permitted, the session wall sends a message to both a client and a server (Dascalu, col. 4, lines 41-50).

Thus, Dascalu discloses sending a message from a session wall to a client and a server, and not from a client to a server as required by the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Dascalu lacks the same features of the present invention that are missing from Shannon. These features are also missing from Brandt.

Brandt provides a common user interface for a software application accessed via the Internet. A software application runs on a web server computer system. Similarly to each of Shannon and Dascalu, Brandt does not teach or suggest a method for a client device that includes searching locally contents of multiple data storage media of the client device for pre-selected data, and sending a notification of detection from the client device to a server via a network upon detecting at least a portion of the pre-selected data on any of the multiple storage media of the client device.

Accordingly, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the limitations of the present invention that are included in the following language of claim 1:

1. A method for a client device, comprising:
searching locally contents of a plurality of data storage media of the client device for pre-selected data, the client device being a personal computing device coupleable to a server via a network; and
upon detecting locally at least a portion of the pre-selected data on any one of the plurality of data storage media of the client device, sending a notification of detection of the pre-selected data to the server via the network.

Similar language is also included in independent claims 20, 31 and 32. Accordingly, the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 20, 31 and 32 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-19 and 21-30 depend on claims 1 and 20 respectively and therefore include the same limitations as claims 1 and 20, as well as some additional limitations. Thus, claims 2-19 and 21-30 are patentable for at least the same reasons as given above with respect to claims 1 and 20.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT AUTHORIZATION

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 15, 2007



Marina Portnova

Reg. No. 45,750

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300